

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Jan 13, 2023

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

VANDERVERT CONSTRUCTION,
INC.,

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,
v.

ALLIED WORLD SPECIALTY
INSURANCE COMPANY (F/K/A
DARWIN NATIONAL ASSURANCE
COMPANY), and WESTCHESTER
FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendants/Counter-Claimants.

No. 2:21-CV-00197-MKD

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

ECF No. 50

Before the Court is Defendants Allied World Specialty Insurance Company (“Allied World”) and Westchester Fire Insurance Company’s (“WFIC”) Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 50. On December 13, 2022, the Court held a hearing on the motion. ECF No. 67. Richard T. Wetmore appeared on behalf of Plaintiff Vandervert Construction, Inc. (“Vandervert”). Michael E. Ricketts appeared on behalf of Defendants Allied World and WFIC (collectively “Defendant Insurers”).

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - 1

1 Vandervert brings claims of breach of contract, negligence, bad faith, and
2 violations of Washington State's Insurance Fair Conduct Act ("IFCA") and
3 Consumer Protection Act ("CPA") against Defendant Insurers, related to their
4 denial of its insurance claim. ECF No. 1-2. Vandervert seeks declaratory
5 judgment in its favor, as do Defendant Insurers. ECF No. 3 at 14-15.

6 Defendant Insurers seek summary judgment on Vandervert's claims, arguing
7 that their denial of coverage was proper. ECF No. 50 at 35-36. The parties are
8 awaiting the results of the Court's *in camera* review of large number of documents.
9 *See* ECF Nos. 24, 44. As explained below, the majority of Defendant Insurers'
10 claims can be resolved without reliance upon those documents. Defendant
11 Insurers' Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED IN PART** and the Court
12 **RESERVES RULING** on the remaining claims.

13 **BACKGROUND**

14 The undisputed relevant facts are as follows. On July 15, 2015, Vandervert
15 entered into a construction contract with Washington Square Hotel Holdings, Inc.
16 ("WSHH") for construction of the Bellevue Hilton Garden Inn Hotel in Bellevue,
17 Washington (the "Project"). ECF No. 51 at 2 ¶ 2; ECF No. 56 at 2 ¶ 1; *see* ECF
18 No. 53-1 (the contract). WSHH procured insurance coverage for the Project from
19 Defendant Insurers, each to cover 50%, with policies effective July 14, 2015. ECF
20 No. 1-2 at 5 ¶ 12; ECF No. 3 at 3-4 ¶ 12; ECF No. 51 at 2 ¶ 3. Allied World issued

1 Policy No. 0309-7022, *see* ECF No. 53-3 (“Allied World Policy”); WFIC issued
2 Policy No. I08877099 001, *see* ECF No. 53-4 (“WFIC Policy”). Allied World’s
3 policy “covers direct physical loss . . . subject to the same [terms] as are contained
4 in . . . the ‘Lead Policy[.]’” ECF No. 53-3 at 13 ¶ 6. The WFIC Policy is identified
5 as the “Lead Policy.” *Id.* ECF No. 53-3 at 13 ¶ 6.

6 WFIC’s Policy provides that Defendant Insurers would “pay for direct
7 physical *loss* to Covered Property from any of the Covered Causes of *Loss*.” ECF
8 No. 53-3 at 24 ¶ A.1 (emphasis in original). “Covered Property” includes property
9 intended to become part of the hotel to be constructed and temporary structures on
10 site. ECF No. 53-3 at 18 ¶ II, 24 ¶ A.1.a. “Covered Causes of *Loss*” include “risks
11 of direct physical loss to the Covered Property, except those causes of loss listed in
12 the Exclusions.” ECF No. 53-3 at 25 ¶ 3.

13 WFIC’s Policy provides, through a separate endorsement form, that all of
14 the “Exclusions” are preceded with the following language:

15 We will not pay for loss or damage caused by any of the excluded
16 events described below. Loss or damage will be considered to have
17 been caused by an excluded event if the occurrence of that event:

- 18 1. Directly and solely results in loss or damage; or
- 19 2. Initiates a sequence of events that results in loss or damage,
20 regardless of the nature of any intermediate or final event in that
sequence.

ECF No. 53-4 at 6 ¶ D. One such “excluded event” is:

1 g. Rain, sleet, ice or snow, all whether driven by wind or not, entering
2 the interior of any Covered Property, unless:

3 1) The exterior of Covered Property is complete; and
4 2) Only if the exterior of Covered Property first sustains loss by a
5 Covered Cause of Loss, through which rain, sleet, ice or snow
6 enters.

7 The exterior of Covered Property is complete only when it has been
8 constructed to a point that it is fully weather resistant and all of the final
9 components of the exterior of the structure and its systems have been
10 completely and permanently installed. The final components include
11 but are not limited to:

12 1) The roof and roof drainage systems;
13 2) Exterior walls including siding;
14 3) Windows;
15 4) Doors;
16 5) Vents and ventilation systems;
17 6) Mechanical and electrical systems.

18 ECF No. 53-3 at 30-31 ¶ g.

19 From October 13, 2016, to October 18, 2016, nearly 4.5 inches of rainfall
20 fell on the still-incomplete Project's roof, accounting for nearly half of the 10
inches in total in the month of October. ECF No. 56 at 3-4 ¶¶ 10, 12; ECF No. 63
at 3-4 ¶¶ 7, 9. Water leaked from the six-story roof into the interior of the
structure, as far down as the subterranean parking garage. ECF No. 56 at 4 ¶¶ 14-
16; ECF No. 57 at 2-3 ¶¶ 4-5; ECF No. 63 at 4 ¶¶ 11-13; *see* ECF No. 59
(attaching video exhibits). Rain in November caused additional water intrusion.
ECF No. 56 at 4 ¶ 16; ECF No. 63 at 4 ¶ 13.

21 ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS'
22 MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - 4

1 On January 23, 2017, WSHH submitted a claim for the loss sustained in
2 these events to Defendant Insurers. ECF No. 56 at 7 ¶ 29; ECF No. 63 at 6 ¶ 26.
3 Defendant Insurers denied coverage. ECF No. 51 at 10 ¶ 30; ECF No. 53 at 3-4, 3
4 n.2; ECF No. 56 at 7 ¶ 30; ECF No. 63 at 7 ¶ 30. On April 27, 2018, Vandervert,
5 now undergoing receivership in the Spokane County Superior Court and through
6 special counsel to the Receiver, filed a claim with the Defendant Insurers for its
7 losses from the same events. ECF No. 56 at 8 ¶ 34; ECF No. 63 at 7 ¶ 31. On
8 November 26, 2019, Defendant Insurers issued a preliminary claim denial. ECF
9 No. 56 at 12 ¶ 52; ECF No. 63 at 8 ¶ 49.

10 Before Defendant Insurers provided any “final coverage determination[,]”
11 ECF No. 56 at 14 ¶ 65; ECF No. 63 at 10 ¶ 62, Vandervert, on May 14, 2021,
12 initiated this lawsuit in Spokane County Superior Court, Case No. 21-2-01306-32.
13 ECF No. 1 at 1-2; *see* ECF No. 1-2. Defendant Insurers filed a Notice of Removal
14 on June 21, 2021. *See* ECF No. 1. On July 12, 2021, Defendant Insurers filed an
15 Answer and Counterclaim. *See* ECF No. 3.

16 **SUMMARY JUDGMENT STANDARD**

17 A district court must grant summary judgment “if the movant shows that
18 there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to
19 judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a); *see Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*,
20 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986); *Barnes v. Chase Home Fin., LLC*, 934 F.3d 901, 906

1 (9th Cir. 2019). “A fact is ‘material’ only if it might affect the outcome of the
2 case, and a dispute is ‘genuine’ only if a reasonable trier of fact could resolve the
3 issue in the non-movant’s favor.” *Fresno Motors, LLC v. Mercedes Benz USA,*
4 *LLC*, 771 F.3d 1119, 1125 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby,*
5 *Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)).

6 The moving party bears the initial burden of informing the district court of
7 the basis for its motion and identifying the portions of the record and the evidence
8 that demonstrate the absence of a genuine dispute of material fact. *Celotex*, 477
9 U.S. at 323 (quoting former Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)). A moving party who does not
10 bear the burden of persuasion at trial will succeed by producing evidence that
11 negates an essential element of the non-moving party’s claim or defense or
12 showing that the non-moving party does not have enough evidence to prove an
13 essential element. *Nissan Fire & Marine Ins. v. Fritz Cos.*, 210 F.3d 1099, 1102
14 (9th Cir. 2000).

15 After the moving party has satisfied its burden, to survive summary
16 judgment, the non-moving party must demonstrate with evidence on the record,
17 “specific facts” showing that there is a genuine dispute of material fact for trial.
18 *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 324. “The mere existence of a scintilla of evidence in support
19 of the plaintiff’s position will be insufficient[.]” *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 252.
20

1 The court “must view the evidence in the light most favorable to the
2 nonmoving party and draw all reasonable inference in the nonmoving party’s
3 favor.” *Rookaird v. BNSF Ry. Co.*, 908 F.3d 451, 459 (9th Cir. 2018). “Credibility
4 determinations, the weighing of the evidence, and the drawing of legitimate
5 inferences from the facts are jury functions, not those of a judge” *Anderson*,
6 477 U.S. at 255.

7 **DISCUSSION**

8 Defendant Insurers argue that summary judgment is appropriate because
9 Vandervert’s losses are excluded from coverage “by the plain and unambiguous
10 language” of the Policies. ECF No. 50 at 20. Defendant Insurers point to the
11 “Rain Exclusion,” the full text of which is recited above, for their conclusion that
12 the Policies exclude “any loss caused by rain or snow entering the interior of the
13 Covered Property, unless ‘[t]he exterior of Covered Property is complete,’ and then
14 only if the exterior is first damaged by a Covered Loss through which rain or snow
15 enters.” ECF No. 50 at 20. In response, Vandervert argues that “‘water damage’
16 and ‘the accumulation of water from any source’ are separate and distinct causes of
17 loss from ‘rain’ (an excluded peril).” ECF No. 55 at 9.

18
19
20

1 The dispute is one of contract interpretation. The Court first addresses
2 principles of insurance contract interpretation,¹ then the “Rain Exclusion,” and
3 concludes with Vandervert’s remaining extra-contractual claims.

4 **A. Interpretation of Insurance Contracts**

5 “Interpretation of an insurance contract is a question of law[.]” *Quadrant*
6 *Corp. v. Am. States Ins. Co.*, 110 P.3d 733, 737 (Wash. 2005); *see Vision One, LLC*
7 *v. Phila. Indem. Ins. Co.*, 276 P.3d 300, 305 (Wash. 2012). “Courts in Washington
8 construe insurance policies as the average person purchasing insurance would,
9 giving the language a fair, reasonable, and sensible construction.” *Vision One*, 276
10 P.3d at 305 (quotations omitted). “Where a term is undefined, it is assigned its
11 ordinary meaning.” *Id.* at 306. “[I]f the policy language is clear and unambiguous,
12 [the court] must enforce it as written[.]” *Quadrant*, 110 P.3d at 737. “[A] clause is

13

14 ¹ The parties do not dispute that Washington State law controls. Indeed, “[w]hen a
15 federal court sits in diversity, it must look to the forum state’s choice of law rules
16 to determine the controlling substantive law.” *Patton v. Cox*, 276 F.3d 493, 495
17 (9th Cir. 2002). Here, as in *Dolson Cos. v. Bedivere Ins. Co.*, “[a]ll events
18 transpired in Washington and the Plaintiff[]-insured[] [is] located in Washington,
19 so Washington law governs the interpretation of the insurance policies at issue.”
20 264 F. Supp. 3d. 1083, 1087 (E.D. Wash. 2017).

1 ambiguous only when, on its face, it is fairly susceptible to two different
2 interpretations, both of which are reasonable.” *Id.* “Ambiguities in the policy are
3 construed against the drafter-insurer.” *Vision One*, 276 P.3d at 306.

4 There are, generally, two types of insurance policies: named-peril and all-
5 risk. *Id.* All-risk policies cover all possible risk of loss except for risks that are
6 specifically excluded. *Id.* Exclusions are considered in light of the policy as a
7 whole, *Quadrant*, 110 P.3d at 739, and exclusions should be construed “strictly
8 against the insurer.” *Vision One*, 276 P.3d at 306.

9 “The court determines coverage by characterizing the perils contributing to
10 the loss, and determining which perils the policy covers and which it excludes.”
11 *Sunbreaker Condominium Assn. v. Travelers Ins. Co.*, 901 P.2d 1079, 1082 (Wash.
12 Ct. App. 1995) (citing *Kish v. Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 883 P.2d 308, 311 (Wash. 1994)).
13 “[C]haracterization of perils focuses on whether the events are contractually
14 distinct, with reference to specific policy language and the perils allegedly
15 involved in the particular factual setting.” *Sunbreaker*, 901 P.2d at 1083.

16 The Policies at issue, here, cover “risks of direct physical loss to the Covered
17 Property, except those causes of loss listed in the Exclusions.” ECF No. 53-3 at 25
18 ¶ 3. The Policies are therefore “all-risk” policies, so the Court turns to the
19 exclusions to determine whether the causes of Vandervert’s losses are explicitly
20 excluded.

1 **B. The Scope of the Policy Coverage and the Rain Exclusion**

2 The Policies provide that the Defendant Insurers “will not pay for loss or
3 damage caused by any of the excluded events[.]” ECF No. 53-4 at 6 ¶ D. The list
4 of excluded events include “[r]ain, sleet, ice or snow, all whether drive[n] by wind
5 or not, entering the interior of any Covered Property[.]” ECF No. 53-3 at 30-31 ¶
6 g.

7 The Rain Exclusion provides that damage from rain, sleet, ice, or snow
8 would be covered if the “exterior of Covered Property is complete” and the
9 exterior of the Covered Property sustains a covered loss. ECF No. 53-3 at 30-31 ¶
10 g. Vandervert does not contend that the exterior of the Project was complete and
11 admits that the Project had only “the first layer” of the roofing system installed and
12 relied upon “temporary water pumps” to drain the flat roof while permanent roof
13 drains were under construction. ECF No. 56 at 2-4 ¶¶ 4-5, 13.

14 Vandervert argues that the Policies’ terms anticipate a peril distinct from
15 “rain.” Specifically, it asserts that rain accumulating on the roof, which it refers to
16 as “ponded water,” ECF No. 55 at 11, is not rain within the Policies’ definition.

17 Vandervert derives its interpretation principally from two places in the
18 Policies. The first is the Policies’ definition of “water damage,” which is “any loss
19 from water except loss caused by or resulting from *flood*.” ECF No. 53-3 at 35 ¶
20 F.9 (emphasis in original). Flood, defined as a “a general and temporary condition

1 during which the surface of normally dry land is partially or completely
2 inundated,” is an excluded event. ECF No. 53-3 at 30 ¶ B.1.f, 34 ¶ F.5. Second,
3 the Policies, in addition to defining “flood,” explicitly remove from that definition
4 “the accumulation of water from any source on a roof or other surface of a
5 building, dwelling or structure.” ECF No. 53-3 at 34 ¶ F.5. Therefore, Vandervert
6 argues that loss from water damage is anticipated and *not* excluded, and while loss
7 from flood is anticipated and *excluded*, loss from “the accumulation of water from
8 any source on a roof” is anticipated and *not* excluded. And, consequently, the Rain
9 Exclusion “is irrelevant to the facts in this case.” ECF No. 55 at 11.

10 Vandervert’s interpretation of the Policies’ terms is not reasonable. The
11 definition of “water damage” cannot be said to create a covered peril distinct from
12 rain. As Vandervert itself explains, the Policies are “all-risk,” therefore all risk is
13 covered; Defendant Insurers are saved from liability only if the contract excludes a
14 particular peril. ECF No. 55 at 7; *Vision One*, 276 P.3d at 306. If the Policies
15 explicitly required a peril be covered, certainly such a clause would require
16 coverage. No such clause for water damage appears in the Policies, only a
17 definition. ECF No. 53-3 at 35 ¶ F.9. Other clauses in the Policies reference water
18 damage and rely upon that definition.²

19

20² For example, the Policies exclude coverage for losses caused by fungus. ECF

1 Further, the inclusion of a definition of “water damage” cannot be
2 reasonably read to override the Rain Exclusion. Similarly, the Policies’ definition
3 of flood, excluding the “accumulation of water from any source on a roof,” cannot
4 be reasonably read to override the Rain Exclusion. ECF No. 53-3 at 34 ¶ F.5. The
5 flood exclusion and the Rain Exclusion are presented in the contract as co-equals,
6 one’s definition cannot be said to cancel-out the other.

7 An average purchaser of insurance reading the Policies would reach the
8 heading “Exclusions,” and understand that loss caused by the events that followed
9 were not covered. Rain entering the interior of the Property through an incomplete
10 roof is explicitly excluded by the Policies, and loss resultant therefrom is not
11 covered simply because “water damage” and “accumulated water” are mentioned
12 elsewhere in the Policies. Indeed, it strains rational thought to imagine what
13 damage rain may cause other than “water damage” or without rain first
14 “accumulating” to some extent.

15
16 No. 53-3 at 30 ¶ B.1.h. But, “if *fungus* . . . results in . . . water damage, we will
17 pay for *loss* caused by that peril.” ECF No. 53-5 at 17 ¶ B.1.h (emphasis in
18 original). Water damage, under the provided definition, is loss from water except
19 loss from flood. ECF No. 53-3 at 35 ¶ F.9. Therefore, if fungus resulted in water
20 damage, it would be covered.

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - 12

1 Vandervert's interpretation aside, the Court must determine the scope of the
2 Rain Exclusion. "Rain" is undefined, so the court assigns the term a "plain,
3 ordinary, and popular meaning." *Kish*, 883 P.2d at 312. Merriam-Webster defines
4 rain as "water falling in drops condensed from vapor in the atmosphere[,]" "the
5 descent of this water[,"] and "water that has fallen as rain[.]" Rain, Merriam-
6 Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/rain#dictionary-entry-1>
7 (last visited December 19, 2022). Further, the rain must "enter[] the interior" of
8 the covered property for the Rain Exclusion to take effect. ECF No. 53-3 at 30-31
¶ g.

10 The remainder of the Rain Exclusion provides some context, as well. The
11 Rain Exclusion does not apply where the exterior of the Property "is fully weather
12 resistant and all of the final components of the exterior of the structure and its
13 systems have been completely and permanently installed." ECF No. 53-5 at 18 ¶
14 B.2.g. "[F]inal components" include "roof and roof drainage systems;" "[e]xterior
15 walls including siding;" and "[w]indows[.]" ECF No. 53-5 at 18 ¶ B.2.g. The
16 Policies described the Project as a "ground up construction of a new hotel[,"] so
17 the Policies anticipate perils pre- and post-exterior completion. ECF No. 53-5 at 5.

18 The plain text of the Rain Exclusion demonstrates that the insured should
19 not expect coverage for losses resulting from rain entering incomplete or exposed
20 property. The requirement that permanently-installed drainage systems are

1 required before the Rain Exclusion would permit coverage is a clear indication that
2 the Rain Exclusion excludes some form of water damage. In sum, the scope of the
3 Rain Exclusion prevents coverage for losses resulting from rain when the rain
4 enters the interior of covered property, prior to that property's weatherproofing—
5 including losses from water damage.

6 **C. Characterizing the Perils**

7 The Court must now “characterize” the peril that caused Vandervert’s losses
8 to determine whether the peril is within the scope of coverage. *Kish*, 883 P.2d at
9 311-12.

10 Vandervert presents evidence of the cause of its losses in the form of
11 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration records, which indicate heavy
12 rain in October and November of 2016. ECF No. 58-4. Vandervert offers the
13 Declaration of Tim Stulc, owner, President, and Chief Executive Officer of
14 Vandervert, for the proposition that the Project “experienced a number of
15 substantial water intrusion events,” that temporary pumps failed and “allowed the
16 water to pond on the roof, where it eventually leaked through penetrations in the
17 roof and the Carlisle vapor barrier roofing membrane.” ECF No. 57 at 3-4 ¶¶ 11-
18 13. Vandervert highlights an email from Ron Keleman, an Allied World Vice
19 President, where even he acknowledges that “water would pool on peel and stick
20 layer and flow into building.” ECF No. 58-32 at 2. Vandervert characterizes the

1 perils contributing to its loss as “water intrusion events,” “water flowing into the
2 building after having first pooled on the roofing membrane[,]” and “ponded
3 water.” ECF No. 55 at 17, 21, 26.

4 The crux of Vandervert’s argument is that the water at issue was no longer
5 “rain” when it intruded into the property. Vandervert makes the metaphysical
6 assertion that “rain” is no longer “rain” after it accumulates on a surface. Indeed,
7 snow falling from the sky is snow, and it remains snow after landing on the
8 ground. Rain, however, becomes a “puddle” or a “pond.” Is “ponded water” still
9 “rain?”

10 The Court is to take the position of an “average person purchasing
11 insurance[.]” *Vision One*, 276 P.3d at 305. As the Washington Supreme Court has
12 instructed, “[a]n insured may not avoid a contractual exclusion merely by affixing
13 an additional label or separate characterization to the act or event causing the loss.”
14 *Kish*, 883 P.2d 308, 311 (Wash. 1994).

15 Vandervert avoids the question of how the water that caused its losses was
16 delivered to the Project so that it may pool, pond, flow, and intrude. The inevitable
17 conclusion is simple: it rained. Vandervert’s invention of a separate peril would
18 vitiate all meaning from the Rain Exclusion. While the Court is to construe
19 ambiguities against Defendant Insurers, it cannot create ambiguity where there is
20 none. *Quadrant*, 110 P.3d at 737.

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - 15

1 Because the Court’s analysis ends at the “language of these policies,”
2 comparing this case to others has limited utility. *Kish*, 883 P.2d at 311. However,
3 Vandervert relies heavily upon *Fidelity Co-op Bank v. Nova Cas. Co.*, so the Court
4 will address it briefly. 726 F.3d 31 (1st Cir. 2013). In that case, a building in
5 Massachusetts was insured under an all-risk policy that covered “water or water-
6 borne material, that backs up or overflows from a sewer, drain or sump,” and
7 contained an addendum covering loss attributable to “flood, meaning a general and
8 temporary condition of partial or complete inundation of normally dry land areas
9 due to: the unusual or rapid accumulation or runoff of surface waters from any
10 source.” *Id.* at 33 (alterations omitted). That policy had a “rain limitation” similar
11 to the Rain Exclusion at issue, here, excluding from coverage loss in “the interior
12 of the building caused by or resulting from rain, whether driven by wind or not,
13 unless the building first sustains damage by a Covered Cause of Loss to its roof or
14 walls through which the rain enters.” *Id.* at 34 (alterations omitted).

15 The building suffered a storm, a great amount of rain fell, overwhelmed the
16 roof’s drainage system,³ submerged two skylights, and water leaked into the
17

18 ³ Vandervert sporadically raises “inadequate and/or defective water pumps which
19 fail to drain ponded water” as a distinct peril. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 55 at 17. In
20 *Nova*, an addendum to the policy explicitly deleted as an exclusion “[w]ater . . .

1 building. *Id.* at 33-34. The First Circuit found that “the ponded water on the roof
2 of the property here was surface water” and not “rain” excluded by the “rain
3 limitation.” *Id.* at 40. Therefore, the entry of the water into the interior of the
4 building was covered. *Id.*

5 Vandervert fails to address the key inquiry in *Nova*. The policy there
6 covered flood damage but excluded rain damage, a dichotomy the court described
7 as “unusual relative to the cases cited by the parties.” *Nova*, 726 F.3d at 37. The
8 fine line between “flood” or “surface water,” and “rain” was particularly at issue.
9 Here, flood and rain are both excluded perils. As explained above, Vandervert’s
10 attempt to raise “water damage” and “accumulated water from any source” as
11 distinct perils created by the Policies’ plain terms is not a sound interpretation.

12
13 that backs up or overflows from a . . . drain.” 726 F.3d at 38. Because that
14 exclusion was deleted, the policy was reasonably read to explicitly cover that event
15 as a distinct peril. Further, the building was complete, and, had the drain been
16 effective, there would be no damage. *Nova*, 726 F.3d at 38. The policy and facts
17 in *Nova* required the conclusion that a blocked or inadequate roof drain was a
18 separate peril. The same cannot be said, here, where the Rain Exclusion wholly
19 excludes rain damage prior to the completion of a permanently installed drainage
20 system, and the Project was an exposed and incomplete construction site.

1 Here, the Policies exclude losses from rain entering into an incomplete roof, there
2 is no similar “surface water” coverage that the average purchaser of insurance
3 would anticipate.

4 The parties also discuss, at length, *Kish*, a Washington Supreme Court case.
5 883 P.2d 308. There, homes were inundated when excessive rainfall overtopped
6 dikes surrounding the Stanwood sewage lagoon. *Id.* at 309. The policy at issue
7 would cover rain damage, but not flood damage. *Id.* at 311. The court had to
8 decide whether the historic rainfall was a distinct peril from “flood.” *Id.* The court
9 found that “the average purchaser of insurance would expect that the term ‘flood’
10 would encompass rain-induced flood.” *Id.* at 312. The contract at issue, here,
11 leads to a similar conclusion. The average purchaser of insurance would expect
12 that the term “rain” would encompass “ponded water” on a roof that was, moments
13 prior, falling from the sky.

14 Defendant Insurers’ denial of coverage was appropriate. The Court grants
15 summary judgment on Vandervert’s breach of contract claim.

16 **D. Vandervert’s Remaining Claims**

17 Vandervert’s remaining claims allege bad faith, negligence, and violations of
18 the IFCA and CPA. The Court addresses each in turn.

19 *1. Bad Faith Claim*

20 ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - 18

1 “In order to establish bad faith, an insured is required to show the breach
2 was unreasonable, frivolous, or unfounded.” *St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v.*
3 *Onvia, Inc.*, 196 P.3d 664, 668 (Wash. 2008). “If the insurer denies coverage
4 based on a reasonable interpretation of the policy, it does not act in bad faith.”
5 *Overton v. Consol. Ins. Co.*, 38 P.3d 322, 335 (Wash. 2002). Defendant Insurers’
6 denial of coverage was premised upon a reasonable and, as explained above,
7 correct interpretation of the policy. The denial of coverage cannot support
8 Vandervert’s bad faith claim.

9 Vandervert highlights the length of time between its filing the claim and the
10 Defendant Insurers’ preliminary decision, and the lack of a final decision. ECF
11 No. 55 at 23-25. “[D]elay does not constitute bad faith unless it is due to a
12 frivolous and unfounded reason.” *Rizzuti v. Basin Travel Serv.*, 105 P.3d 1012,
13 1021 (Wash. Ct. App. 2005). “‘Whether an insurer acted in bad faith is a question
14 of fact,’ which can be decided on summary judgment only if reasonable minds
15 could not differ in finding the insurer’s conduct unreasonable.” *Rushforth Constr.*
16 *Co. v. Wesco Ins. Co.*, No. C17-1063-JCC, 2018 WL 1610222 at *4 (W.D. Wash.
17 Apr. 3, 2018) (citing *Smith v. Safeco Ins. Co.*, 78 P.3d 1274, 1277 (Wash. 2003)).
18 “The nonmoving party may not rely on speculation, argumentative assertions, or
19 unsupported affidavits.” *Rizzuti*, 105 P.3d at 1019.

20
ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - 19

1 Vandervert filed its claim April 27, 2018. ECF No. 56 at 8-10 ¶¶ 34-46;
2 ECF No. 63 at 7 ¶¶ 31-43. Vandervert admits that delay from at least April 27,
3 2018, to January 30, 2019, was due to Vandervert's receivership proceedings,
4 which made the compilation of relevant information difficult. ECF No. 56 at 9 ¶
5 40-42; ECF No. 53-8 at 26-27. The evidence indicates that the delay continued to
6 May 14, 2019, due to some confusion as to how files should be delivered. ECF
7 No. 58 at 6-7 ¶¶ 23-24. And, for some unexplained reason, on August 20, 2019,
8 Vandervert sent supplemental records. ECF No. 58 at 7 ¶ 25.

9 On November 26, 2019, the Defendant Insurers issued a preliminary denial
10 which emphasized that they have not taken a final position. ECF No. 53-8 at 32.
11 Vandervert substantively responded to the denial on March 27, 2020. *See* ECF No.
12 13-5. In April and May of 2020, Vandervert's counsel sent emails to Defendant
13 Insurers seeking a response, and Defendant Insurers' counsel indicated
14 investigation was ongoing due to new developments. ECF No. 58-30; ECF No.
15 58-31. On October 8, 2020, Defendant Insurers requested more information and
16 documents, but indicated that they had not departed from their preliminary
17 determination. ECF No. 53-9 at 6-9. On December 14, 2020, Vandervert provided
18 supplement information and documents. *See* ECF No. 58-33. Vandervert's
19 counsel requested updates in February of 2021. ECF No. 58-34. Defendant
20 Insurers' counsel did not substantively respond. ECF No. 58-34. On March 11,

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - 20**

1 2021, Vandervert sent Defendant Insurers notice of its intent to file this lawsuit.

2 ECF No. 58-35.

3 Although Vandervert claims that the delay from 2018 to 2021 is the fault of
4 the Defendant Insurers, the undisputed evidence shows that a significant portion of
5 that delay is owed to Vandervert. The delay attributable to the Defendant Insurers
6 prior to their preliminary denial is a matter of months, not years. The same is true
7 of delay following Vandervert's March 2020 response to the preliminary denial
8 through the filing of the lawsuit. The undisputed evidence shows a complicated
9 investigation involving many documents.

10 In *Rushforth*, the court found unreasonable an insurers' inexplicable ten-
11 month delay, during which it did not communicate with the insured, and which
12 ended only after the insured filed suit. 2018 WL 1610222 at *4-5.

13 Comparatively, in *Ins. Co. of Pa. v. Highlands Ins. Co.*, the insurer delayed
14 coverage for over a year due to debatable terms in a policy. 801 P.2d 284, 287
15 (Wash. 1990). The Court granted summary judgment for the insurer because "the
16 delay throughout was related to [the insurer's] attempts—albeit clumsy—to resolve
17 the coverage issue." *Id.*

18 The Court declines to consider whether Defendant Insurers' delay was
19 motivated by a frivolous or unfounded reason at this time. The parties are awaiting
20

1 the Court’s determination of privilege for thousands of pages of documents
2 submitted for *in camera* review. The Court reserves ruling on this issue.

3 2. *IFCA Claim*

4 Vandervert’s First Cause of Action arises under the IFCA. ECF No. 1-2 at
5 9. The IFCA “creates a cause of action for unreasonable denials of coverage and
6 also permits treble damages in some circumstances.” *Perez-Crisantos v. State*
7 *Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, 389 P.3d 476, 482 (Wash. 2017) (emphasis omitted). The
8 statute requires that an insured be unreasonably denied a claim for coverage. *See*
9 *id*; RCW 48.30.015(1)-(3). As found above, Vandervert was not unreasonably
10 denied coverage. Therefore, Vandervert cannot succeed on its IFCA claim as a
11 matter of law. The Court grants summary judgment as to the IFCA claim.

12 3. *Negligence and CPA Claims*

13 Vandervert’s Fourth Cause of Action is entitled “Negligence,” and alleges
14 that “[t]he Insurers were in a fiduciary relationship with Vandervert and were
15 under a duty to deal fairly with their insured[.]” ECF No. 1-2 at 12 ¶ 58. “A
16 breach of a fiduciary duty imposes liability in tort. . . . In order to prevail, [the
17 plaintiff] must establish (1) the existence of a duty owed to them; (2) a breach of
18 that duty; (3) a resulting injury; and (4) that the claimed breach was the proximate
19 cause of the injury.” *Miller v. United States Bank*, 865 P.2d 536, 543 (Wash. Ct.
20 App. 1994).

1 Vandervert's Fifth Cause of Action arises under the CPA. The CPA
2 provides that “[u]nfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or
3 practices in the conduct of any trade or commerce are hereby declared unlawful.”
4 RCW 19.86.020. “A denial of coverage does not constitute an unfair or deceptive
5 act or practice as long as it is based on reasonable conduct of the insurer.” *Overton*
6 *v. Consol. Ins. Co.*, 238 P.3d 322, 330 (Wash. 2002). For the same reason that the
7 Court declines to address summary judgment at this time on Vandervert’s bad faith
8 claim, the Court declines to address summary judgment as to Vandervert’s
9 Negligence and CPA claims. There are a large number of documents undergoing
10 an *in camera* review that Vandervert may be entitled to discover. If discovered,
11 Vandervert must be afforded the opportunity to review the documents for materials
12 relevant to bad faith, negligence, or the CPA.⁴

13 CONCLUSION

14 For the reasons stated herein, the Court grants summary judgment as to
15 Vandervert’s breach of contract claim and IFCA claim. The Court reserves ruling
16 as to Vandervert’s negligence and CPA claims. The Court hereby enters
17 declaratory judgment as to the parties’ rights under the Policies.

18 Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED:**

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
55310
55311
55312
55313
55314
55315
55316
55317
55318
55319
55320
55321
55322
55323
55324
55325
55326
55327
55328
55329
55330
55331
55332
55333
55334
55335
55336
55337
55338
55339
55340
55341
55342
55343
55344
55345
55346
55347
55348
55349
55350
55351
55352
55353
55354
55355
55356
55357
55358
55359
55360
55361
55362
55363
55364
55365
55366
55367
55368
55369
55370
55371
55372
55373
55374
55375
55376
55377
55378
55379
55380
55381
55382
55383
55384
55385
55386
55387
55388
55389
55390
55391
55392
55393
55394
55395
55396
55397
55398
55399
553100
553101
553102
553103
553104
553105
553106
553107
553108
553109
553110
553111
553112
553113
553114
553115
553116
553117
553118
553119
553120
553121
553122
553123
553124
553125
553126
553127
553128
553129
553130
553131
553132
553133
553134
553135
553136
553137
553138
553139
553140
553141
553142
553143
553144
553145
553146
553147
553148
553149
553150
553151
553152
553153
553154
553155
553156
553157
553158
553159
553160
553161
553162
553163
553164
553165
553166
553167
553168
553169
553170
553171
553172
553173
553174
553175
553176
553177
553178
553179
553180
553181
553182
553183
553184
553185
553186
553187
553188
553189
553190
553191
553192
553193
553194
553195
553196
553197
553198
553199
553200
553201
553202
553203
553204
553205
553206
553207
553208
553209
553210
553211
553212
553213
553214
553215
553216
553217
553218
553219
553220
553221
553222
553223
553224
553225
553226
553227
553228
553229
553230
553231
553232
553233
553234
553235
553236
553237
553238
553239
553240
553241
553242
553243
553244
553245
553246
553247
553248
553249
553250
553251
553252
553253
553254
553255
553256
553257
553258
553259
553260
553261
553262
553263
553264
553265
553266
553267
553268
553269
553270
553271
553272
553273
553274
553275
553276
553277
553278
553279
553280
553281
553282
553283
553284
553285
553286
553287
553288
553289
553290
553291
553292
553293
553294
553295
553296
553297
553298
553299
553300
553301
553302
553303
553304
553305
553306
553307
553308
553309
553310
553311
553312
553313
553314
553315
553316
553317
553318
553319
553320
553321
553322
553323
553324
553325
553326
553327
553328
553329
553330
553331
553332
553333
553334
553335
553336
553337
553338
553339
553340
553341
553342
553343
553344
553345
553346
553347
553348
553349
553350
553351
553352
553353
553354
553355
553356
553357
553358
553359
553360
553361
553362
553363
553364
553365
553366
553367
553368
553369
553370
553371
553372
553373
553374
553375
553376
553377
553378
553379
553380
553381
553382
553383
553384
553385
553386
553387
553388
553389
553390
553391
553392
553393
553394
553395
553396
553397
553398
553399
553400
553401
553402
553403
553404
553405
553406
553407
553408
553409
553410
553411
553412
553413
553414
553415
553416
553417
553418
553419
553420
553421
553422
553423
553424
553425
553426
553427
553428
553429
553430
553431
553432
553433
553434
553435
553436
553437
553438
553439
553440
553441
553442
553443
553444
553445
553446
553447
553448
553449
553450
553451
553452
553453
553454
553455
553456
553457
553458
553459
553460
553461
553462
553463
553464
553465
553466
553467
553468
553469
553470
553471
553472
553473
553474
553475
553476
553477
553478
553479
553480
553481
553482
553483
553484
553485
553486
553487
553488
553489
553490
553491
553492
553493
553494
553495
553496
553497
553498
553499
553500
553501
553502
553503
553504
553505
553506
553507
553508
553509
553510
553511
553512
553513
553514
553515
553516
553517
553518
553519
553520
553521
553522
553523
553524
553525
553526
553527
553528
553529
553530
553531
553532
553533
553534
553535
553536
553537
553538
553539
553540
553541
553542
553543
553544
553545
553546
553547
553548
553549
553550
553551
553552
553553
553554
553555
553556
553557
553558
553559
553560
553561
553562
553563
553564
553565
553566
553567
553568
553569
553570
553571
553572
553573
553574
553575
553576
553577
553578
553579
553580
553581
553582
553583
553584
553585
553586
553587
553588
553589
553590
553591
553592
553593
553594
553595
553596
553597
553598
553599
553600
553601
553602
553603
553604
553605
553606
553607
553608
553609
553610
553611
553612
553613
553614
553615
553616
553617
553618
553619
553620
553621
553622
553623
553624
553625
553626
553627
553628
553629
553630
553631
553632
553633
553634
553635
553636
553637
553638
553639
553640
553641
553642
553643
553644
553645
553646
553647
553648
553649
553650
553651
553652
553653
553654
553655
553656
553657
553658
553659
553660
553661
553662
553663
553664
553665
553666
553667
553668
553669
553670
553671
553672
553673
553674
553675
553676
553677
553678
553679
553680
553681
553682
553683
553684
553685
553686
553687
553688
553689
553690
553691
553692
553693
553694
553695
553696
553697
553698
553699
553700
553701
553702
553703
553704
553705
553706
553707
553708
553709
553710
553711
553712
553713
553714
553715
553716
553717
553718
553719
553720
553721
553722
553723
553724
553725
553726
553727
553728
553729
5537230
5537231
5537232
5537233
5537234
5537235
5537236
5537237
5537238
5537239
55372310
55372311
55372312
55372313
55372314
55372315
55372316
55372317
55372318
55372319
55372320
55372321
55372322
55372323
55372324
55372325
55372326
55372327
55372328
55372329
55372330
55372331
55372332
55372333
55372334
55372335
55372336
55372337
55372338
55372339
55372340
55372341
55372342
55372343
55372344
55372345
55372346
55372347
55372348
55372349
55372350
55372351
55372352
55372353
55372354
55372355
55372356
55372357
55372358
55372359
55372360
55372361
55372362
55372363
55372364
55372365
55372366
55372367
55372368
55372369
55372370
55372371
55372372
55372373
55372374
55372375
55372376
55372377
55372378
55372379
55372380
55372381
55372382
55372383
55372384
55372385
55372386
55372387
55372388
55372389
55372390
55372391
55372392
55372393
55372394
55372395
55372396
55372397
55372398
55372399
553723100
553723101
553723102
553723103
553723104
553723105
553723106
553723107
553723108
553723109
553723110
553723111
553723112
553723113
553723114
553723115
553723116
553723117
553723118
553723119
553723120
553723121
553723122
553723123
553723124
553723125
553723126
553723127
553723128
553723129
553723130
553723131
553723132
553723133
553723134
553723135
553723136
553723137
553723138
553723139
553723140
553723141
553723142
553723143
553723144
553723145
553723146
553723147
553723148
553723149
553723150
553723151
553723152
553723153
553723154
553723155
553723156
553723157
553723158
553723159
553723160
553723161
553723162
553723163
553723164
553723165
553723166
553723167
553723168
553723169
553723170
553723171
553723172
553723173
553723174
553723175
553723176
553723177
553723178
553723179
553723180
553723181
553723182
553723183
553723184
553723185
553723186
553723187
553723188
553723189
553723190
553723191
553723192
553723193
553723194
553723195
553723196
553723197
553723198
553723199
553723200
553723201
553723202
553723203
553723204
553723205
553723206
553723207
553723208
553723209
553723210
553723211
553723212
553723213
553723214
553723215
553723216
553723217
553723218
553723219
553723

1. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, **ECF No. 50**, is

GRANTED IN PART.

2. The District Court Executive is directed to enter **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT** in favor of Defendant Insurers and against Vandervert declaring as a matter of law that:

a. Defendants Allied World Specialty Insurance Company and Westchester Fire Insurance Company have no duty under the terms of Policy Nos. 0309-7022 or I08877099 001 to pay for Vandervert Construction, Inc.'s losses sustained from rain during the construction of the Bellevue Hilton Garden Inn Hotel in Bellevue, Washington.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Executive is directed to file this Order and Judgment accordingly and provide copies to all counsel.

DATED January 13, 2023.

s/Mary K. Dimke
MARY K. DIMKE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE